

Remarks/Arguments:

The present invention relates to an accumulation display device and a mobile data terminal. Highlights or replays of various scenes of a program currently viewed on the accumulation display device can be viewed on the mobile data terminal.

Claims 1-7 and 16-18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sibley (US 7,302,224) in view of Shteyn (US 2002/0144007) and further in view of Kinno (US 2003/0154217). The rejection of claim 7 is rendered moot by the cancellation of that claim. The remaining claims are patentable over the art of record for the reasons set forth below.

Applicants' invention, as recited by claim 1, includes features that are neither disclosed nor suggested by the art of record, namely:

... a reception unit that receives ... index information associating a currently broadcasted program content with an index and specifying a scene of the program ...

... a metadata interpretation unit that interprets the index information and the trigger information of the currently broadcasted or the accumulated program content ...

As acknowledged by the Official Action, Sibley fails to teach a metadata interpretation unit. Thus, Shteyn was combined with Sibley. Shteyn's metadata, however, corresponds only to trigger information. The index information is completely missing from Shteyn.

Applicants' claim 1 further states:

... the index information includes a program ID for identifying a program corresponding to the index information, an ID for identifying the index information, starttime data of the corresponding program, and finishtime data of the corresponding program ...

Originally filed claim 8 includes starttime data and finishtime data. Starttime data and finishtime data is missing from Sibley. Thus, Kinno was used to reject claim 8 and was described in the Official Action as disclosing starttime and

finishtime. Kinno's metadata, however, is specifically disclosed as linking text data describing a digest of each scene of the metadata to an address of the scene. Thus, Kinno lacks Applicants' ability to extract specific scene information based on mode information included in the trigger information and restructuring the program content based on the mode information. Thus, Applicants' claim 1 recites:

... the accumulated image processing unit further extracts at least a part of the program content from the index information based on contents of the trigger information, restructures the program content extracted based on the mode information, and outputs the restructured program content.

It is because Applicants' claim 1 includes trigger information as recited above that, when mode information specifies "replay" as an example of special reproduction, the specific scene information (a part of the program) corresponding to or necessary for replay reproduction are extracted from the program content, restructured and reproduce. Neither Sibley, Shteyn nor Kinno is able to restructure and reproduce program content based on metadata which includes trigger information and index information. Accordingly, Applicants' claim 1 is patentable over the art of record.

Claims 2-6 are patentable by virtue of their dependency on allowable claim 1.

Claims 16 and 18, while not identical to claim 1, are also patentable over the art of record for reasons similar to those set forth above with regard to claim 1. Claim 17 is patentable by virtue of its dependency on allowable claim 16.

Claims 8, 9 and 11 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sibley in view of Kinno and further in view of Gardere (US 6,678,332) and Zander (US 6,360,218). The rejection of claim 8 is obviated by the cancellation of that claim. Claims 9 and 11 are patentable by virtue of their dependency on allowable claim 1. Claim 12 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sibley in view of Kinno and further in view of Munetsugu (US 7,134,074). Claim 15 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sibley in view of Schrader (US 2002/0166123). Claims 13


Application No.: 10/594,774
Amendment Dated: February 9, 2010
Reply to Office Action of: November 10, 2009

KAN-113US

and 14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sibley in view of Hoshino (US 2004/0249861) and Munetsugu. These claims are all patentable by virtue of their dependency on allowable claim 1.

In view of the amendments and arguments set forth above, the above-identified application is in condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,


Lawrence E. Ashery, Reg. No. 34,515
Attorney for Applicants

LEA/fp

Dated: February 9, 2010

P.O. Box 980
Valley Forge, PA 19482-0980
(610) 407-0700

FP_622787